

Addendum No. 1 – Vendor Questions and City Responses

RFP No. 2025-IT201 – Financial Management System / Enterprise Resource Planning

City of Marshall

Issue Date: January 28, 2026

Purpose. This addendum documents vendor questions received and the City's responses. Unless specifically amended herein, all requirements, terms, and conditions of the RFP remain unchanged.

Instructions. Vendors shall incorporate the responses below into their proposals. Where a response is marked "TBD," the City will provide the requested information by subsequent addendum or direct release consistent with the RFP.

Vendor: Caselle (Questions received from Wade Walker)

Intro

Question	City Response
1. How did you hear about us?	The City identified Caselle and all other vendors during market research and peer-city reference checks as part of its evaluation of municipal ERP/FMS solutions and vendor outreach for this procurement.

General

Question	City Response
2. How many hard-core power users do you need within the system?	Approximately 15 core/power users (IT and Finance plus at least one primary power user from each department), in addition to broader departmental users depending on module licensing and workflow design.

Financials

Question	City Response
3. Roughly how many GL accounts do you have?	The City currently maintains approximately 700–800 (active and non-active) chart of accounts. As part of this initiative, the City anticipates the need to establish a new chart of accounts and is seeking a vendor with demonstrated expertise to provide guidance and best-practice recommendations aligned with industry standards.
4. Estimated number of active vendors in AP?	The City currently maintains approximately 500–600 vendor records. As part of this project, the City anticipates the need to review and purge inactive or duplicate vendors and implement industry-standard vendor management best practices.
5. How many bank accounts do you reconcile?	The City currently utilizes three banking institutions and operates a pull-cash model. As part of this initiative, the City anticipates the need to review and modernize its cash management and banking processes in alignment with industry best practices.

Question	City Response
6. How many accounts do you have in AR, and what are you billing for? (i.e., miscellaneous AR accounts outside utilities—rentals, leases, airport hangars, etc.)	TBD for total account count. Miscellaneous AR (non-utility) includes items such as municipal court fines/fees, permits and licensing fees, rentals/leases, and other charges established by City ordinances and fee schedules. The City will provide a list of primary AR billing categories and approximate transaction volumes.

Utilities

Question	City Response
7. How many utility customers do you have?	Approximately 10,000 active utility accounts (City estimate).
8. What services do you bill for in Utilities? (Water, Sewer, Electric, Garbage, etc.)	Water, wastewater/sewer, solid waste (garbage) services, drainage fee, and donation option.
9. How many billing cycles do you have per month?	Four (4) billing cycles per month.
10. What type of meters do you have? (Badger, Sensus, Neptune, etc.—READY Manager may be the meter reading portion)	Kamstrup meters with Kamstrup READY Manager utilized for meter reading and related workflows.

Online Payments

Question	City Response
11. Which vendor are you currently using for payments?	STW (now part of OpenGov) is the City's current financial system of record and is currently used for certain payment workflows.

Question	City Response
12. Do you prefer to pass the fees on to your customers as a convenience fee, or absorb them?	Preferred approach: pass card-processing/service fees to the payer as a convenience/service fee where allowed, while continuing to offer no-fee options such as cash, check, and ACH/bank draft. Final policy/fee approach will be confirmed by Finance during implementation and may vary by payment channel and payment type.
13. What is your average bill amount (\$\$\$)?	TBD (City to confirm the current average monthly utility bill amount, by customer class if available).
14. What is your billing frequency? (Monthly, bi-monthly, etc.)	Monthly
15. Do you have a recent merchant statement from the past month or two that I can review?	Yes. A recent merchant statement can be provided to the selected vendor/merchant services partner as needed (subject to City confidentiality/procurement controls).
16. If you know your current rates for credit/debit card transactions (and any additional fees from your current provider), can you please share those with me?	TBD (City will provide current effective rates/fees from the latest merchant statement(s) and/or processor fee schedule as part of implementation and/or selection discussions, subject to procurement controls).

Vendor: OpenGov

Attachment A – Clarification Requests

HR-PR-002

Question	City Response
Will NEOGOV continue to be the HR/Payroll system of record following the vendor selection?	The City currently utilizes NEOGOV for recruiting/applications (GovernmentJobs.com). The City's future-state HR/Payroll system of record will be confirmed post-award based on the selected solution; the City is open to (a) ERP-native Payroll and core HR, with integrations to NEOGOV where needed, or (b) continued use of select NEOGOV modules with appropriate integrations.
What NEOGOV products are being leveraged today? Are there any future products that are being considered that will impact your desired outcomes in the Financial Management System?	Currently, the City's public-facing job application site is powered by NEOGOV (GovernmentJobs.com). Additional NEOGOV modules/products in use (e.g., onboarding, performance, learning, HRIS) and any planned additions are TBD and will be confirmed by the City during discovery/implementation.
What functionality would you like completed within the mobile/kiosk time entry?	Desired time entry capabilities (draft): mobile-friendly and kiosk/clock options for field and non-desk staff; time capture by shift/crew; supervisor approvals; leave/time-off requests; and (where applicable) labor distribution/costing to departments, cost centers, projects/work orders, or grant codes. City will confirm detailed workflows and priorities during discovery.

Question	City Response
What functionality would you like completed with the portal for non-desk workers?	Desired employee self-service portal capabilities (draft): view/download pay statements and year-end forms (W-2, 1095); view accruals and request leave; update select personal/profile information; and access key HR communications and policies. City will confirm additional portal requirements during discovery.

INT-002

Question	City Response
What Courts software will you be leveraged?	LT Systems (courts/case management).
What Permitting/Code software will be leveraged?	iWorQ/iWorks is currently leveraged for permitting/code-related workflows. If a proposer includes a permitting/code module within their solution, please provide details and integration approach.
Where will the payment processing for these applications (Courts, Permitting/Code) occur?	Current-state: many payments are accepted in-person and/or through existing payment channels. Future-state: the City prefers a centralized enterprise cashiering/POS and online payment approach with integrations back to the relevant line-of-business systems and the ERP (as applicable). The final approach will be confirmed during solution design.

INT-006

Question	City Response
Are you currently leveraging a timekeeping/clock system?	Not citywide. The Library has a standalone timekeeping system; other departments do not currently use a single, unified timekeeping/clock system.
Do you desire this to be available in the Financial Management system? Or will this operate in a standalone capacity?	The City desires a single timekeeping/time-entry capability that can be used across all departments (ERP-native timekeeping is preferred), rather than multiple standalone department systems.

P2P-002

Question	City Response
Do you require any documentation to be signed by vendors within your portal?	Yes. The City would like the ability to obtain electronic signatures/acknowledgements for vendor onboarding and compliance documentation (as applicable).
Are you performing any additional solicitations that require multi year contract management?	Not at this time (no additional solicitations requiring multi-year contract management beyond current needs).

RFP Administration Questions (Submitted by OpenGov)

Question	City Response
RFP Section 6, Subsection 6.3.9 requests that proposers "Provide resume details for all key personnel by listing the following in the order in which it appears: name, title, contact information...". Please confirm whether the City expects resumes to be formatted explicitly using Roman numerals as shown in the RFP, or whether the intent is simply that the listed information be included and presented in that order within each resume.	The City's intent is that each resume includes the requested information and presents it in the same order. A specific Roman numeral format is not required; proposers may use their standard resume format as long as the required elements are clearly provided in order.

Question	City Response
<p>RFP Section 9 references that “Responses to Questions/Addenda (will be) Issued January 28, 2026.” Would the City consider extending the submission deadline by one to two weeks (to February 13 or February 20) to allow vendors sufficient time to incorporate the addenda into their responses?</p>	<p>No. The City is not extending the submission deadline at this time; proposals remain due by the deadline stated in the RFP.</p>

Vendor: Can/Am Technologies – Teller Cashiering

Question	City Response
<p>1. Does the City prefer either/or: (a) a centralized cashiering process where all payments are made through one software, with real-time, bi-directional integration back to other software (like UB, Permitting, etc.), or (b) decentralized where each department/software records their own payments and updates the financial system? If the City would like to move to a centralized cashiering approach, can you list the applications that you would like the new cashiering application to take payments for?</p>	<p>The City prefers a centralized cashiering/POS approach for all departments, with real-time integrations to the ERP and applicable line-of-business systems. Applications/payment types targeted for centralized intake include (at minimum): Utility Billing, miscellaneous Accounts Receivable, Municipal Court payments, and Permitting/Code payments (and other fees assessed per City fee schedules).</p>
<p>2. Would the City provide the total number of users, including supervisors, that will access only the new Cashiering/POS module?</p>	<p>Estimated: ~12 users total (including supervisors). This is an initial estimate for sizing; the City will confirm user counts by location/role during discovery.</p>
<p>3. Can the City list the current POS equipment and model you would like the Cashiering solution to integrate with, or would the City like additional POS equipment to be included in the RFP response (receipt printers, scanners, cash drawers, check imaging/MICR devices, encrypted credit card swipe and EMV/chip/tap-to-pay devices)?</p>	<p>The City is open to proposers including new POS hardware as part of the recommended solution (receipt printers, scanners, cash drawers, check imaging/MICR, and PCI-compliant EMV/chip/tap devices). Please bundle the equipment needed to ensure compatibility and reliable integrations.</p>

Question	City Response
4. What credit processors are the City currently using?	Current merchant services provider: Texas Bank and Trust (City estimate/Finance to confirm any additional processors by channel). Solution is called Merchant.
5. Would the City like the new cashiering solution to become the City's Online Customer Payment Portal? If so, what applications would the City like to take online payments for?	The City is open to using the cashiering solution as a unified online customer payment portal if it meets functional, security, and usability requirements. Desired online payment coverage includes Utility Billing, miscellaneous Accounts Receivable, Municipal Court payments, and Permitting/Code payments, with a consistent customer experience and appropriate integrations.
6. Would the City like the cashiering solution to create an Image Cash Letter (ICL) containing check images for deposit, and send it to your bank? If so, what bank?	The City is interested in remote deposit/check imaging capabilities (including ICL, if supported by the City's bank). Banking partner(s) to be confirmed; Texas Bank and Trust is a primary banking/merchant relationship.
7. Does the City have a multi-check scanning process in place for recording checks and invoices in batch? If not, should this be included in the response? What is the annual volume that the City would scan using this process?	Yes, the City currently scans checks and would like to continue this capability in the future solution. Annual scan volume is TBD (Finance to confirm). Proposers should describe batch scanning and how images/indexing are retained and retrieved.

Question	City Response
8. Does the City have scenarios where different departments/agencies need to submit end of day receipt summary information? If so, would the City like to automate that?	Yes. Multiple receipting locations require end-of-day balancing, deposit preparation, and revenue summary reporting. The City wants to automate end-of-day closeout workflows, reporting, and (where applicable) posting to the ERP/GL.
9. For cash receipting, what are your top five issues you experience? Of those five, which is most important and why?	Draft (to be confirmed by Finance): (1) inconsistent processes across departments/locations; (2) manual reconciliation and deposit tracking; (3) limited real-time integration to line-of-business systems and the ERP; (4) limited reporting and audit trails for cashiering activity; (5) need for modern payment methods and customer self-service. Most important: strengthening controls and reconciliation through a centralized cashiering/POS with strong audit trails and real-time posting to reduce errors, rework, and revenue risk.

Vendor: GovSense

Question	City Response
1. We noticed ClearGov referenced in the RFP. Is the City's intent to replace ClearGov as part of this evaluation, or to continue using it alongside a new solution?	The City currently uses ClearGov for budgeting and has not pre-determined whether it will be retained (integrated) or replaced. Proposers should demonstrate and price their budgeting and budget book capabilities; the City will evaluate available budgeting options and confirm the future-state (replace vs. integrate) during selection/implementation.
2. If ClearGov is currently in use, is it being used for full budget development and budget book production, or for a more limited portion of the budgeting process?	ClearGov is currently used for full budget development and budget book production (City confirmation).
3. Beyond budget development, is the City evaluating additional modules as part of this RFP or a future phase, such as ACFR or PAFR reporting, Budget in Brief, ad hoc monthly or quarterly reporting, and GASB compliance reporting?	The City is interested in robust financial reporting capabilities (including ad hoc and recurring monthly/quarterly reporting) as part of this procurement. Additional formal reporting modules (e.g., ACFR/PAFR production tools, Budget in Brief) may be considered during evaluation or as a future phase depending on proposer capabilities and cost. Final scope will be confirmed by Finance during selection.

Question	City Response
4. What specific historical data must be converted, how far back, and for what operational or reporting purposes?	<p>Minimum conversion requirement: one (1) full fiscal year of detailed transactional history by module plus all open items (e.g., open AP, open AR, open purchase orders, open projects, active assets, and current-year balances). Proposers must include pricing for two (2) years of history as an option and may also provide an optional price for three (3) years of history.</p>
5. For integrations with NEOGOV, ClearGov, READY Manager, banking partners, and payment processors, should vendors assume responsibility for end-to-end delivery including third-party coordination, or will the City and/or its advisor retain responsibility for third-party readiness and testing?	<p>Vendors should assume responsibility for end-to-end delivery of required integrations (interface development/configuration, project management, coordination with third parties, and testing support) in partnership with the City. The City (and advisor, if applicable) will support stakeholder participation and provide access where available.</p>
6. During scripted demonstrations, will scoring be based strictly on live system capability as demonstrated, or will configuration-based and roadmap-committed functionality already documented in Attachment A be considered equivalent for scoring purposes?	<p>Demonstration scoring will prioritize current, working capability as demonstrated in the proposed solution. Configuration-based functionality that can be shown (and reasonably delivered within the implementation) may be considered. Roadmap-only functionality will generally not receive demonstration credit unless it is contractually committed with clear timelines and acceptance criteria.</p>

Question	City Response
<p>7. For Utility Billing, does the City expect a single, citywide cutover at go-live, or would a phased or parallel deployment be acceptable (for example, Finance first, Utility Billing later), particularly to mitigate revenue risk during initial billing cycles?</p>	<p>The City is open to implementation approaches that reduce revenue risk, including phased deployment and/or parallel run for Utility Billing, provided end-to-end billing, receipting, and GL posting controls are maintained. A phased approach may be acceptable (Finance first, Utility Billing later), but sequencing will be finalized during implementation planning.</p>
<p>8. Can the City clarify whether it expects a single, unified cashiering and POS experience across Utility Billing, Accounts Receivable, and other receipting activities (for example, permits, deposits, miscellaneous fees), and whether all cashiering locations and drawers must be live at initial go-live?</p>	<p>The City expects a unified cashiering/POS experience and consistent payment controls across Utility Billing, AR, and other receipting activities. The City is open to a phased enablement of locations/drawers where it reduces risk and is operationally practical, but proposers should describe how they will deliver a unified model and the recommended go-live sequencing.</p>
<p>9. For the ten-year Total Cost of Ownership evaluation, does the City have assumed annual escalation rates for SaaS, support, or services pricing, or should vendors propose their own escalation assumptions in Attachment E?</p>	<p>Unless otherwise specified in the RFP, proposers should clearly state their escalation assumptions (if any) and apply them consistently across the 10-year TCO model in Attachment E. For evaluation consistency, the City may reference CPI-U (Dallas-Fort Worth-Arlington) or other applicable price index guidance for multi-year contracts; proposers should disclose any contractually required increases separately.</p>

Question	City Response
10. Can the City clarify the role and level of authority of its external advisor during proposal evaluation, demonstrations, and implementation, including whether the advisor will provide scoring input or formal sign-off on deliverables?	The City's staff and core evaluation team will perform scoring and make selection recommendations. The City's external advisor (if engaged) will provide advisory support and facilitate best practices but will not have independent scoring authority or formal sign-off on deliverables.
11. What duration and level of post-go-live stabilization or hypercare support does the City expect to be included in the base implementation pricing versus offered as an optional service?	Proposers should include a defined post-go-live stabilization/hypercare period in base implementation pricing. Minimum expectation is 90 days of hypercare support; proposers may also offer extended hypercare (e.g., 120–180 days) as an optional service. Please describe staffing model, hours of coverage, escalation, and SLAs during stabilization.

Vendor: SpryPoint

The City noted its interest potentially including in scope the procurement of a City-wide asset management solution (RFP Section 3.3). SpryPoint requested the user counts by business unit (Full Users and Light Users) for the following departments/use cases.

City Response (draft): The table below is provided for pricing and sizing purposes. User counts are estimates and may be refined during discovery.

Business Unit / Use Case	Full Users	Light Users
Code Enforcement	4	2
Facilities – Community Centers	2	6
Facilities – Convention Center (if applicable)	2	4
Facilities – Pet Center (if applicable)	2	3
Facilities – Library (if applicable)	1	4
Facilities – City Hall (if applicable)	2	6

Business Unit / Use Case	Full Users	Light Users
Facilities – Court (if applicable)	1	3
Parks & Recreation (if applicable)	6	8
Fire Department (if applicable)	2	10
Police Department (if applicable)	3	12
Sanitation	4	6
Public Works – Administration	3	4
Public Works – Water Distribution / Wastewater Collection	8	6
Public Works – Wastewater Treatment	6	5
Public Works – Water Treatment	5	4
Other Business Units (Departments/Divisions)	5	10